LShri Lal K. Advani]

not agree with him. But *'ae* is the elected Chief Minister of that State. And let me recall, i_n 1984, an elected Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir State was dislodged, was removed from Government **and** the argument given at that time. I recall, was not merely that he has lost nis majority. In this House we 'heard of that Chief Minister being accused of lack of patriotism, accused of being mixed up with anti-national elements, accused of having promoted and trained terrorists **in** Punjab. You just recall the amount of embarrassment you had to face and he had to face when three years later both of them joined hands and became partners in the coalition ...

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: What is the harm... *(Interruptions).*

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : मैं आपका सबसे बड़ा आलोचक हूं, इनसे भी ज्यादा, लेकिन आलोचक होते हुए भी मैं यह मानता हूं कि... (व्यवधान)...

श्री गुलाम रसूल मट्टू : हम आपको अच्छी तरह जानते हैं ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : मैं सार्वजनिक, इन पब्लिक लाइफ... (व्यवधान)..

श्री गुलाम रसूल मट्टू : अगर किसी पार्टी के आदमी ने किसी बात को सियासी मसले की बुनियाद पर कही हो और उसके बाद उन दो पार्टियों के दिल मिल जायें, तो उसमें क्या बुराई है ?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: In public life, there are limits. In public life and public debates, public utterances at levels of responsibility at least, there should be a certain *Lakshman Rekha;* there shoidd be certain limitations which we should not cross and there should be no verbal excesses and you have to basically trust the Htriotism and commitment to national unity and integrity of political adversaries.

With these words, I conclude.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; The House stands adjourned for lunch till 2.39 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirtynine minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-nine minutes past two of the clock The Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Statement to be made by hon. Minister, Shri Natwar Singh.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

II. Recent deliberations in U.S. Congress on South Asia

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Madam Deputy Chairman,

Last week the US Congress has considered some actions on South Asia which, if enacted, would have adverse implications for our bilateral relations with the United States.

» We would not Iike to pre-judge the linal outcome of the congressional proceedings nor, in normal circumstances, would government have commented on them. Yet the circumstances oi congressional action have made it imperative to emphasize that improvement in Indo-US relations requires a better appreciation of India's point of view. Financial flows or technology transfer are not ihe totality of the relationship nor can they be nsed as levers to force policy changes upon up. A healthy relationship between tw_0 sovereign democracies has to be built on mutual interest, trust and confidence. Devoid of these elements our relationship with the U.S. cannot prosper much less retain its present level.

India made a commitment many years ago not to develop nuclear weapons. We

have kept our word. Our nuclear materials and facilities are dedicated to peaceful uses. We are against both vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. But for reasons which we have stajjied openly and unequivocally, India is not prepared to accept a discriminatory non-proliferation regime. We stand by this position, and nothing wiil persuade or compel us to change it. It is regrettable that the Senate Committee has thought fit to equate India's peaceful nuclear programme wil'n Pakistans re1entless pursuit of a weapons-oriented programme. We cannot, and will not, accept this distorted view of the reality in our part of the world.

We have conveyed our strong feelings to the US Government at all levels. The Prime Minister has conveyed our concerns to President Reagan. I too have told the US Ambassador in Delhi that the consequences of the proposed congressional actions should be viewed in the perspective of our bilateral relations and remedial measures should be considered on an urgent basis.

As Hon'ble Members are aware, we are now dealing with the recommendations of a Committee of the Senate. We shall await the final outcome. We have noted that President Reagan is very concerned about the South Asia part of the Senate Committee's recommendations. Both India and USA 'have striven to establish a productive bilateral agenda for the future. We shall formulate our considered response in the light of future developments. Government would like to assure the House that we will not allow pressures from any direction to alter our basic policies.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, the statement which has been laid on the Table by the Minister of State for External Affairs says that the latest US. Congress actions on South Asia "would have adverse implications for our bilateral relations with the United States." In another part of the statement, he has said, "The circumstances of congressional action have made it imperative to emphasise that improvement in Indo-US relations requires a better appreciation of India's point of view." Madam, a couple of weeks ago we had heard the Prime Minister making a statement ary replied to certain clarifications in connection therewith on his recent visit to the U.S.A. and there he had stated—and I quote:

"I undertook a working visit to U.S. at the invitation of President Rfpgan. We attach great important to our relations with the United States; We believe that a continuing dialogue between our countries is indispensable for a better understanding of each other and to expand mutually beneficial cooperation in bilateral and international affairs. I had breakfast meetings with congressional leaders, including the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate Majority Leader. As a result there is now greater recognition in the United States of the gravity of Pakistan's unrelenting quest for nuclear weapons".

Besides this, while meeting the pressmen after his meetings with the U.S. President, Vice-President and before leaving for India, our Prime Minister had stated at the press conference—I quote:

"I see a shift in U.S. policy"

he declared after having sessions with the President and his top officials—

". . .perhaps because of the realisation how close Pakistan is to making a nuclear weapon".

In the Consultative Committee meeting for the Ministry of External Affairs, our Prime Minister had stated that US leaders saw a greater role for Tndia in the region and beyond and they realised the gravity of the implications of Pakistan's nuclear programme. The Prime Minister told this to External Affairs Consultative Committee on Tuesday i.e 27th October: And Mr. Natwar Singh, the Minister of State for External Affairs, according to press reports, summed up the Prime Minister's visit to the U.S.A. and his talks with the American leaders as "very fruitful and very cordial, and the visit had carried Indo-US bilateral relations forward in the right direction".

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

Now if in the assessment of our Prime Minister and that of out Minister of State for External Affairs, the Indo-US relations had taken a step forward towards the right direction and if in their assessment, they found that there was a change in the US policy, there was a shift" in the US policy towards this region, and particularly there was a tilt in favour of India as against Pakistan, my first question for clarification would be, what had happened in the meantime which led the US Congre s to take these actions which, according to Mr. Natwar Singh's today's statement, would have "adverse implications for our bilateral relations with the United States" and it required a better appreciation of India's point of view? Should one conclude lhat even after their visit, there was no better appreciation of India', point of view? If now the Minister of State comes out with a statement that it requires a better understanding of India's point of view on the part of U.S., then should one conclude that there was underatanding or better appreciation of India's point of view even after our Prime Minister's visit to the U.S.A. with a horde of Ministers and officials ■ and having rounds of discussion with the President and his top officials? This is one clarification, I read.

The second is, it betrays how poor the assessment of our Prime Minister or the Minister of External Affairs is that immediately after they had gone on to say that there has been a "shift" in the U.S. policy towards India and it has taken a right direction, he is coming back now with another statement that it has a greater implication. So, I find here that there is a failure which, first of all, our Minister of State for External Affairs should note—■ the failure on their part to bring forth: the case of India to the foreign countries, particularly the USA. Secondly, there is a failure on the part of our Prime Minister and the Ministry of External Affairs and, for that matter, the Minister of External Affairs, to correctly asses tne V5S policy towards India, particularly in this area. So, will the Minister of State for External Affairs agree with me that in the background of his failure and also in the background of their poor assessment of the US point of view, they will change the statement which they made earlier, immediately after 'the Prime Minister's visit to the US?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Madam Deputy Chairman, on the llth November the Prime Minister, while speaking about his tour, said in his reply as follows:

> "We cannot link ourselves with a country like Pakistan and become insignificant like Pakistan and let us not keep equating India with Pakistan. We made it clear to eveybody"—that *'s,* in the United States—"that there is no question of India signing the NPT. I do not know why some of our friends here got so agitated. Perhaps, they knew that we were going to say this and they thought they will get some kudos by saying this before ve did so."

He created an impression the other day that things have improved between our country and the United States. He said in the main, statement.

> "The agenda drawn up during my 1985 visit has largely been completed, and a new agenda has now been put in place."

Further he said:

> "We agreed to extend the Science and Technology initiative, which has shown positive results, for another three years beyond 1988."

The whole statement conveyed an impression that his visit to the United States was a. grand success. He even said;

> 'There is a greater perception and awareness of our good relations, of our stand in respect of various issues."

Madam, now all of a sudden, the United States Senate Committee has been taking various measures, firstly, to equate India and Pakistan and secondly to scuttle any form of financial economic, military understanding with India. 1 think certain

people who are in the Pakistan lobby in the United States Congress, have been very busy after tbe visit of the Prime Minister. They have been successful in creating a climate of opinion in favour of Pakistan and against India. The Prime Minister addressed the Members of the Congress. When he visited Washington, he met ihe Speaker and leader and the leader of the majority in the Senate. As a result, he said:

> "There is now a greater recognition in the United States of the gravity of Pakistan's unrelenting quest for nuclear weapons."

All these things have become aborted, so to say.

Why have now the Members of the United States Congress taken an ad ver -e turn against India? What are the compulsions? Who are working against Indian interests there? Is it to give $4 billion economi, aid to Pakistan, to get clearance for that purpose that thi; is being contrived? Or is there any deeper game in these things, in this whole affair?

1 think, the statement made by the Prime Minister the other day and some of the assumptions of my friend, Mr. Natwar Singh, have not been correct. They have been proved wrong. The Govtrnment of India's assessment of the United States policy towards India has been completely out of reality. Very soon after the visit of the Prime Minister, it is amazing that such a development has taken place. This only proves that the United States is not friendly to India, it is not friendly to our point of view, they are in a way hostile to our interests. I think, our diplomacy has failed, our approach has failed, and our mission in the United States, our diplomatic mission in the United State, has failed in assessing the reality, assessing the views, policy views, in the State Department and in the Congress, and we have landed ourselves in this predicament.

Madam, may I ask the Minister, my friend, whether he will have a thorough review Of our policy towards the United States? Our approach, our views, our whole perception in regard to the Indo-U.S, relations have beea shoddy. I expect the Minister to go into this question deeply, find out the truth and tell the United States Government where we stand in various matter;—there should not be any misunderstanding on this, ambiguity on this—and tell them where we stand ai, far as India is concerned,

3.00 P.M.

SHRl MURASOLI MARAN (Tamil Nadu): It i_s the worst crisis of confidence between India and the United States since the US went back on its commitments in regard to Tarapore. Pakistan is getting whatever it has wanted. The new six-year $ 4 billion aid package will be avail able to Pakistan exactly when it needs their assistance. It is a pity that India Pakistan are being equated. We have made ourselves very clear that our nuclear programme j. purely for peaceful purposes, but on the other hand the world knows what Pakistan is indulging in.

It is a pity that some of the super powers do not want India to stand on its own legs and prosper and spend its money on development work. They want to create compulsions so that India may divert its scarce resources to arms and armaments. I think that is what is happening now.

At the same time we have to see what has been going on. After hon. Prime Minister returned from his trip *to* America with the aid and advice of Mr. Natwar Singh and others, he made an announcement that his talks with Reagan were a resounding success, I would like to know from the hon. Minister: what does he mean by 'resounding success'? Now, we see it is a resounding failure. We have been duped. As marxist leader, Mr. Ghosh, has asked, we would like to know what was the assessment of the Prime Minister. He could not assess it properly. He could not gauge the feelings of President Reagan or the American Senators or the American public. It was a poor show. We see his failure in the domestic front. Now, we see the failure in the foreign affairs also. I would accuse the hon. Prime Minister that his foreign policy has become a resounding failure', because we know he has been changing

[Shri Murasoli Maran]

his perceptions offi and on. We know what he said in his famous speech here in Delhi and I quote. He said:

> "India would give enemies of India such a rebuff that even their *'Nacmees'* and *dadies* would remember it."

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DAPARTMENT OF POWER IN THE MINISTRY OF ENERGY (SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI): No, 'Daadees'.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: I am sorry. 'Daadees',

AN HON. MEMBER: How about *'Nances'?* Everybody was asking who is 'Nanee'.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Not Nancy, it is 'Naani.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: You don't settle your score through me.

The Prime Minister was kind enough to say that he never mentioned US. At that time it was accused that destabilisation move was on by CIA. Later, at a particular time CIA was cut out. There was a destabilisation move, but not by CIA. So, the Prime Minister has been changing from one position to another.

Secondly, in the Consultative Committee meeting the Prime Minister had -tated that US had now changed its perception and wanted India to play a bigger role in this region. What does it mean? Which region? How big one is to go? Do we have the resources? Do we have the power, do we have the arms and armaments?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): And who is the United States to do this?

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Who are they to recognise you?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): I would like to know whether the hon. Member can refer to the proceedings of another Committee in the House, lt is not permitted.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN; I am quoting newspaper reports. I am not a member of the Consultative Committee.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He has got every right. If the External Affairs Minis-try's Consultative Committee meeting reports can find a place in the press, can't he refer to this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over. Please finish now.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: I have not yet finished.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are not to make a speech. You are to seek clarifications.

SHRl MURASOLI MARAN; Why this shift in foreign policy is taking place? Now Pakistan is receiving $ 4 billion in aid and we are not receiving what we have been promised. At the same time, what Prime Minister says is very naive. He says "it is unfortunate lhat the press in India gave undue importance to Pakistan. It is a small country in size. AH your concentration goes to it. You should not bother about Pakistan. Let it do what it claims. We don't bother about it. We will handle it when tha time comes." This is what the Prime Minister has said. I would say that it is an irresponsible statement.

THE DEPUTY CHAiRMAN: Now, you make your own speceh.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Just a minute. Pakistan has been receiving whatever they wanted. In this statement it is said that remedial measures wil! be taken. What remedial measures, I do not know. As Mr. Gurupadaswamy has pointed out even the Indian Embassy at Washington has failed to convince the Senate and the Congressmen.

Because of interruption I forgot to mention one more thing. The Prime Minister has stated that U.S. wants us to play a bigger role. You know that he has added one more sentence which is very crucial. I quote "The U.S. backed Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement in support of his assertion....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Madhya Pradesh): He has come to Sri La oka.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Just because the Americans have appointed you as a regional power and they have blessed you, you have sent your army to Sri Lanka. This is your foreign policy. Have you sent IPKF to play the role of a regional power? Every day you are spending Rs. 3 crores for this operation. Yon have already spent more than Rs. 300 crores for IPKF in Sri Lanka. I would along with Mr. Gurupadaswamy like you to reassess our foreign policy. Don't be a henchman of somebody else. We are not a chaprasi of U.S. Therefore, 1 would like to know from the Minister what measures he is taking to create a new evaluation of bur failed foreign policy. Thank you.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : महोदया, जिस वक्तव्य पर स्पष्टीकरण मांगे जा रहे हैं और वह स्पष्टीकरण थोड़ी सी चर्चा का रूप ले रहे हैं, वह वक्तव्य विदेश राज्य मंत्री ने स्वयं दिया है। अनेक विषयों पर हम वक्तव्यों की मांग करते रहते हैं, लेकिन सत्ता पक्ष हमें अनुगृहीत नहीं करता। इस बार वे स्वयं वक्तव्य ले कर आये हैं। इसका अर्थ यह है कि एक गंभीर विषय पर वे सदन में चर्चा चाहते हैं, सदन की प्रतिक्रिया चाहते हैं। और जहां तक अमरीकन रवैये का सवाल है, सदन का पूरा समर्थन सरकार के साथ है कि हम अमरीका की इस नीति को गलत मानते हैं कि वह भारत और पाकिस्तान को एक ही तराजू में तोल रहा है यह नीति इसलिये भी गलत है कि भारत ने अणविक क्षेत्र में जो प्रगति की है, उसका लक्ष्य शान्ति है, विकास है, जब कि पाकिस्तान की नीति सीधे-सीधे बम बनाने की नीति है।

यह बहस अमरीकन कांग्रेस में अभी चल रही है। सिनेट की सब-कमेटी ने अभी एक निर्णय लिया है। मुझे लगता है कि इस निर्णय की वहां पुष्टि होने वाली है। हम आशा करते हैं कि न हो, लेकिन मैं अपनी आशंका व्यक्त कर रहा हूं क्योंकि अमरीका से कोई तत्कालिक स्थिति पर हम व्यवहार नहीं कर रहे हैं। अमरीका के साथ हमारे पुराने अनुभव हैं। क्या इस सदन के लिये और दूसरे सदन के लिये भी यह उचित होगा, व्यावहारिक होगा कि हन अपनी पर्लियामेंट की तरफ से एक संदेश अमरीका की कांग्रेस को भेजें कि इस संबंध में कोई भी अन्तिम निर्णय करने से पहले वे इस देश की पार्लियामेंट की भावनाओं को ध्यान में रखें।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अमरीका में जो हमारे राजदूत हैं, उन्हें हम को अपने विचार-विमर्श के लिये वापस बुला लेना चाहिये। न केवल वे अपने कर्तव्य का पालन करने में विफल रहे हैं, लेकिन अमरीकी निर्णय के प्रति अपना रोष प्रकट करने के लिये कूटनीतिक दृष्टि से भी यह कदम जरूरी है। बड़े आश्चर्य की बात है कि भारत में जो अमरीकी राजदूत हैं वे जब चाहें प्रधान मंत्री से मिल सकते हैं। मगर वाशिंटन में जो भारत के राजदूत हैं, वे इस मामले में राष्ट्रपति रीगन से नहीं मिल सके। राजदूत सेक्रेटरी आफ स्टेट से नहीं मिल सका और आर्मा कोस्ट जो अंडर सेक्रेटरी उससे मिला था। उन्होंने कहा कि आपकी भावना व्हाईट हाउस तक पहुंचा दी है, किसी आफिशियल के माध्यम से ? यह भेदभाव क्यों ? वह अफसर कौन है, उसका नाम क्या है। क्या इतने गम्भीर मसले पर हमारे राजदूत वाशिंगटन में जाकर राष्ट्रपति से मुलाकात नहीं कर सकते ? क्या वह भारत की भावना स उन्हें अवगत नहीं करा सकते ? क्या यह हमारी विफलता नहीं है ?

तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि मुझे अमरीकी सीनेट की सब-कमेटी के निर्णय से ज्यादा धक्का नहीं लगा।

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

अमरीका की एक विश्व नीति है। पाकिस्तान उसमें खपता है भारत नहीं खपता है। जब से पाकिस्तान बना है जब से उसने अमरीका की अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रणनीति का एक हिस्सा होना स्वीकार किया है जब मौका आता है अमरीका पाकिस्तान की तरफ झुक जाता आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री अमरीका गये और नटवर सिंह जी गये सारे देश को अमरीका के निर्णय पर धक्का लगा होगा। धक्का तो अमरीकी नीति से समय-समय पर लगता रहता है लेकिन इस समय उनको जरूर धक्का लगा होगा कि अभी अभी तो प्रधान मंत्री की अमरीकी यात्रा की सफलता की ध्वनियां आसमान में गूंज रही हैं अभी अभी अमरीका ने हमें इस क्षेत्र में एक शक्ति के रूप में उभरने का प्रमाण पत्र दिया है और अभी-अभी अमरीका ने एक ऐसा फैसला कर लिया है जो हमें और पाकिस्तान को एक तराजू में तौलता है जो अमरीका के साथ हमारे संबंधों में बिगाड़ पैदा करता है एक खटास पैदा करता है। सब-कमेटी चाहती है कि अमरीका वर्ल्ड बैंक को कह दे कि भारत को मदद मत दो। उन वित्तीय संस्थाओं को कह दे कि भारत को सहायता मत दो। वह चाहता है कि हमें टैक्नालाजी न मिले। क्या अर्थ है इसका ? हमारे प्रधान मंत्री हमारे राज्य मंत्री अमरीका की यात्रा में इस बात का पता क्यों नहीं लगा सके ? उस दिन जब प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि अमरीका का पर्सेप्शन बदल गया है। हिन्दी में पर्सेप्शन का मतलब होता है दृष्टिकोण। तो दृष्टिकोण में दृष्टि बदली है या खाली कोण बदला है ? अमरीका की भारत के बारे में तब तक दृष्टि नहीं बदलेगी जब तक कि अमरीका की दुनियां को देखने की दृष्टि नहीं बदलेगी। यह जो शिखर सम्मेलन हो रहा है उसमें बदलीं हुई दृष्टि का प्रमाण मिल जायेगा तो बहुत अच्छी बात है। लेकिन पाकिस्तान को हथियार इसलिये दिये जा रहे हैं कि अफगानिस्तान में रूसी फौजें थीं। जब रूस की फौजें नहीं थीं तब भी हथियार दिये जा रहे थे निरन्तर हथियार दिये जा रहे थे। लेकिन इस पर इस बार नीति का क्या इम्पैक्ट हो गया। क्या हमारी अमरीका के प्रति सुविचारित नीति है सुनिश्चित नीति है ? या हवाई झोंके के साथ है ? क्या पाकिस्तान के प्रति हमारी कोई नीति है ? अभी प्रधान मंत्री ने प्रैस सम्मेलन में कहा था कि पाकिस्तान का नाम बार-बार मत लो क्यों बार बार पाकिस्तान पाकिस्तान की रट लगाते रहते हो तो अमरीका के हथियार देने के बाद काहे को शिकायत हो रही है ? पाकिस्तान अपने में कुछ नहीं है। पाकिस्तान को अगर अमरीका का समर्थन समाप्त हो जाये तो पाकिस्तान हमारे साथ मित्रता के साथ रहना स्वीकार कर लेगा। मगर यह समर्थन समाप्त नहीं होगा। प्रधान मंत्री तो हमारे नए हैं लेकिन नटवर सिंह जी तो घुटे हुए कूटनीतिज्ञ हैं। इन्हें तो कम से कम अमरीका को साफ बात कहनी चाहिये थी कि पाकिस्तान ऐटम बम बना रहा है आप क्या करने जा रहे हैं ? उन्होंने कह दिया कि आप दोनों एक ही तराजू में हो ?

दोनों आपस में बैठ कर संधि कर लें हम यह आशीर्वाद देंगे। यह बराबरी नहीं मानी जा सकती इसलिये नहीं कि हम राष्ट्रों की समानता के समर्थक नहीं हैं बल्कि इसलिये कि जिस आधार पर यह बराबरी मानी जा रही है वह आधार गलत है। हमारा आणविक प्रोग्राम शान्तिपूर्ण है। चीन ने ऐटम बम बना लिया और हमने अभी तक फैसला नहीं किया। इस मामले पर ज्यादा देर नहीं हो सकती।

अब मैं तीसरा सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं कि अमेरिका के बारे में हमारी नीति क्या है पाकिस्तान के बारे में हमारी नीति क्या है और आणविक सवाल पर सचमुच हमारी नीति क्या है। अगर कल पाकिस्तान ने एटम बम बना लिया तब क्या हम बनायेंगे या यह बात हम पाकिस्तान को रोकने के लिये कह रहे हैं ? अगर हम बनायेंगे तो हमें

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, last week, the American Senate Appropriation Committee has taken three important decisions which go against the very interests of this country and South Asia. The first one was, it endorsed the Reagan administration's request for giving loans against nuclear proliferation for a ful! six years and the proposed 4.02 billion military and economic aid programme for Pakistan. Secondly, it instructed the U.S.A. to vote against the World Bank's International Monetary Fund and the Asian Development Bank loans to any country in South Asia whose nuclear activities with a military potential are not safeguarded by international inspection. Thirdly—it is also very interesting and it goes against the very understanding with, the U.S.— it decreed a cut-off of the U.S. high technology transfer etc. Madam, these decisions recommended by the Senate go against the very interests of this country and South Asia. They also place India on par with Pakistan so far as the nuclear issue is concerned. We should strongly condemn the shift in the American policy. We we were given to un derstand th::t when the Prime Minister of India visited the U.S.A. recently there was complete understanding and amity between these two countries. The Minister made a statement in this House and we were all made to believe that there is a change in the American policy and ; is complete agreement between the Prime Minister of India and the President of the U.S.A. But then *y* why is there a drastic shift? I *do* not knew made this drastic shift in the American policy. Secondly. I would like to know from the Foreign Minister whether it is correct that the Pakistan lobby is very active and the anti-Indian lobbies are very active in America and that made America to change its policy and th lobby has completely failed. Thirdly, we were given to understand that there was a complete understanding be; America and India du: to the talks that were held between the Prime Minister and the President, In connection with Bofors, we all know Mr. Win Chadha who is absconding from the country. The whole country knows. Many summons were sent. The Prime Minister's visit was also for meeting and pacifying American Administration whom Win Chaddha made revelation and setting all these things with American Administration because Win Chaddha who was involved in Bofors dealings had revealed to American Administration all about these dea-. There are allegations against many VIPs in this country; I do not know, even against the Prime Minister, and Win Chadha was involved. The Prime Minister's visit to America was connected with this also. And then the matter was settled and there was a complete understanding with the American Government. I would like to know from the Minister whether it is not a fact that Win Chadha was involved in Bofors and the Prime Minister has tried to settle the matter with the American Administration.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not at all relevant.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra); How is it relevant here?

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY; He has tried to sette the matter with the

[Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy]

American Administration and Ihe American Administration has agreed. I would like to know whether he or any important persson visiting America met the Pakistani lobby which is very active in America and whether, as Mr. Vajpayee has demanded, whether India is considering recalling our Ambassador for further clarifications and further instructions.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA (Delhi); My friends from the Opposition have sough! a lot of clarifications and there is the question of perception. Some friends have said that the perceptions have changed and that the Ministry was not able to make a good assessment. Times don't stand still. I think the perceptions of America and India, and perhaps of Pakistan, a all changing all the time, and, therefore, re-assessment have to be mdde. However, I would like to ask for clarifications from the honourable xMiiiister. in view of the historical perspective of the role played by America in this region with) regard i_0 Pakistan, is it our perception that this recommendation by the Senate Sub-Committee is not going to be passed and is not going to go further to a finality, or is it our perception that it is going to go through, as Vajpayeeji said, and if it is going to go through, will we consider the point made by the Minister that financial flow or technology transfer is not the totality of our relationship? Would the Minister kindly consider alternative sources of high tech transfer to India and not depend on the USA? That is one. Second, it is not only a question of not signing the NPT and trying to come to an understanding with Pakistani Government. Would you seriously consider a re-assessment of our own nuclear programme and to do it on a very priority basis so that this question of whether we are doing something or are not doing something or whether we are going to have a positive response or a suitable response to Pakistani nuclear programme, is not hanging fire, so that there is some finality and a quick decision on this matter, so that the whole world knows as well as this House knows.

I would also like to know whether this step by the USA is going to have repercussions of policy, of foreign policy, in this region whether it will affect our re-lationship with China or with Sri Lanka, as has been mentioned, or even with Pakistan, how Pakistan is going to react to this matter. Thank you.

SHRl GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir); Madam Deputy Chairman, the honourable Minister has made the statement in this House today. But I find that we are very firm on the issue of nuclear programme and our policy is very clear on this issue and, as Atalji has correctly said, the entire country is behind the Government and they cannot treat us like this.

The second mosts disturbing thin a which has not been mentioned in the Minister's statement, is the grant of aid $ 4.02 billion to Pakistan. As this is vitally connec- -ted with the security of the country in general and the security of Jammu and Kashmir in particular, I would like the Minister to give us the details with regard to the form and manner in which this $ 4.02 billion aid is going to be given to Pakistan.

Now, Madani, I have got two questions to ask of the honourable Minister. My first qustion is this; Apart from the steps Atalji has propounded, that is, a resolution by this House or the other House, will the honourable Minister inform us that this thing was only expected of a Congressional Sub-Committee? What is the hierarchical order under which it can become a perfect law? What is the Committee next that will consider it or what is the other Committee that will con sider it ? This is number one and I want the details.

My other question to which, to my mind, is the most important is this: Has the hon-ourable Minister any plans to have a ttia-logue with those persons who count in this hierarchy so that the viewpoint of the Government of India is made known to them and made known to them positively? This is a very important thing because our telling them, our having a dialogue with those people who count in the hierarchy and who ought to take a decision is very important. So. we must have some sort of a dialogue. Has the Minister given any instructions to our Ambassador in Washington to meet those people in the hierarchy there or does the Minister also

consider going himself to America or sending somebody else to impress upon those people who count there? I am asking this question because, to my mind, it appears accessary that we approach those people who now count in the decision-making process with regard to this Sub-Committee's reolution. What plans has he got? Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Yes, Mr. Kapil Verma.

SHRl KAPIL VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, the s'atement is mature and level-headed and I must also say that no country, particularly a country like India which is so big, can and shouid be run on emotions. We have to be cool-headed and we must take a decision in accordance with our national interest and according to the compulsion of the day. I need not say that the whole country is united in expressing concern at what is happening and it is a great disappointment that President Reagan, whom our Prime Minister met, gave certain impressions which have been belied. Something has happened in between. They have gone back on what they have been indicating to us. It is very difficult for me to understand the reason why the United States is so impervious to the sentiments of eighty crores of people. I also fail to understand how India has been equated with Pakistan. It is also very difficult for me to believe that the U.S administration there has no hand in what is happening in US Congress because hese things have taken place in quick succession, that is, lobbying and decisions of Senate Committee, Sub-Committee, etc. So, I want to know from the Government what final outcome the Government is expecting out of the present deliberations. Do they expect President Reagan to intervene and to veto it? Or, are the reports being put out by the White House saying that the President is disturbed are again another ploy to mislead us? Secondly, the Minister has said that he wants remedial action on an urgent basis. I want to know what kind of action he is expecting from the U.S. leadership? Thirdly, the Prime Minister has just concluded, during his last visit, an agreement on science and technology with the United States. Will the latest Senate decision affect the super computer and other technological assistance that America promised to India? Now, I will come to the most important part of it. By this signal America has allowed Pakistan to go ahead with its nuclear programme. So it is no longer a debating point now. Pakistan is about to get a bomb or jt has 'a bomb already. It is a nuclear threat to India. I want to know from the Minister; what steps is the Government going to take for the security of the country? In view of the new threat that has now become a reality, a stark reality, the country Cannot ignore it. The Prime Minister and the Minister have been assuring the nation that at the right moment the nuclear options will be reviewed. In my persona] opinion—I am not talking of my party but I am talking of my personal opinion—that time has now come when we should review our options. I have been pleading for making a bomb. But let the Government say and explain to us whether they aie going to review the options now? *(Time bell rings)*

Lastly, just one point more. There is scope for strengthening our diplomatic efforts in Washington. It is very strange that such things should have happened. I will like to know from the hon. Minister in what manner he is strengthening our diplomatic efforts in Washington.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : उपसभापति महोदया माननीय राज्य मंत्री श्री नटवर लाल जी ने सदन के सामने जो बयान दिया है.... (व्यवधान) नटवर लाल और नटवर सिंह में कोई ज्यादा अन्तर नहीं है (व्यवधान)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Madam, I have been accused of many things in my life but never of being Natwar Lal! (*Interruptions*)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मैं यही बात कहने वाला हूं कि नटवर लाल को जैसे कोई जल्दी पकड़ नहीं सकता उसी तरह से बातों में इनको पकड़ना आसान नहीं है (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : करेक्ट नाम यूज कीजिये। (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : महोदया चाणक्य ने कोई अढ़ाई हजार वर्ष पहले एक वाक्य कहा था कि जो राजा यह कहे कि दुश्मन ने हमको धोखा दे दिया उसको गद्दी पर रहने का एक क्षण भी अधिकार नहीं है । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जब कोई सरकार या हकूमत यह कहे कि दुश्मन ने हमको धोखा दे दिया तो जैसे चाणक्य ने कहा था उसको गद्दी पर रहने का हक नहीं है । हर आठ रोज दस रोज पर इस सरकार का दृष्टि-कोण विदेशी सरकारों के प्रति बदलता रहता है और हमारा सम्बन्ध भी हर दस-पन्द्रह रोज में बदल जाता है । एक रोज यह कहते हैं कि हमारा सम्बन्ध अच्छा हो गया है फिर दस रोज के अन्दर आप उससे दुश्मनी साध लेते हैं । यह विदेश मंत्रालय और विदेश नीति की बड़ी विफलता है । यह हम लोगों ने पिछले तीन महीनों में देखा है जिसको आपने दस रोज पहले कहा कि हम इसके हित में हैं ठीक उसके खिलाफ आपको काम करना पड़ रहा है । श्रीलंका में आपने क्या कहा ? कहा कि हम जा रहे हैं तमिलों को सहायता देने के लिए, एयर ड्रॉपिंग कर रहे हैं और आपकी विदेश नीति का इतना फेल्योर हुआ कि फिर उनको मारने जाने लगे और उनको अब मार रहे हैं । इसी तरह से दस रोज पहले कोई वाया मीडिया नहीं भारत सरकार के नेता—भारत सरकार के नेता ही कह सकते हैं हम—कोई टेक्निकल टर्म नहीं है, भारत के नेता, प्रधान मंत्री जी और खुद विदेश मंत्री अमेरिका में जाकर सीधे-सीधे बात करते हैं तब भी उनके नजरिये का पता आपको नहीं चलता । उस समय कहते हैं कि हमारी भारी सफलता हुई । आज मैं इनका वाक्य पढ़ना चाहता हूं । इस बयान में कितने कन्ट्रा-डिक्शंस हैं किस घबड़ाहट से यह बयान लिखा हुआ है उसकी ओर मैं आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं । पहला वाक्य जो दूसरे पैरे का है इससे लगता है कि विदेश मंत्रालय के दिमाग का सोचने का दिवाला निकल चुका है । मैं केवल इनकी पंक्ति पढ़ रहा हूं : "हम अभी यह अनु-मान नहीं लगाना चाहेंगे" सुनिये बहुत अच्छी बात कह रहे हैं, "कि कांग्रेस की इस कार्रवाई का अन्तिम निष्कर्ष क्या होगा" मतलब अभी दुविधा में हैं, और आगे क्या कहते हैं, "और न ही सामान्य परिस्थितियों में सरकार इस पर कोई टिप्पणी करती ।" मतलब यह असामान्य स्थिति है, असामान्य स्थिति है तब आप इस पर टिप्पणी कर रहे हैं । लेकिन एक ओर कह रहे हैं कि "हम अभी अनुमान नहीं लगाना चाहेंगे" आपको अनुमान नहीं लग रहा है फिर इसको असामान्य स्थिति किस तरह से कह रहे हैं और असामान्य स्थिति मानकर आप इस सदन में अपनी चिन्ता लेकर आये हैं कि हमारी सरकार किस तरह से फंस रही है, हमारा जो यू एस० ए० से संबंध है वह कितना तनावपूर्ण हो रहा है । आपको अभी इतना अनुमान नहीं है तो इसको लाने की क्या जरूरत है। मैं चार्ज करता हूं कि यह विदेश मंत्रालय के दृष्टिकोण में या सोच में कमी है । हो सकता है कि आप खुद ही कह रहे हैं कि हम अनुमान नहीं लगाना चाहेंगे ।

दूसरी बात अंतिम पैरा में है : "जैसा कि माननीय सदस्य जानते हैं हम सीनेट की एक समिति की सिफारिशों पर विचार कर रहे हैं और हमें इसके अंतिम निष्कर्ष की प्रतीक्षा रहेगी " अभी आप प्रतीक्षा कर रहे हैं, "हमने यह पाया है कि राष्ट्रपति रीगन सीनेट समिति की सिफारिशों के दक्षिण एशिया संबंधी अंश के प्रति बहुत व्यग्र हैं " अभी इनको यह साफ नहीं हुआ है, राष्ट्रपति के एटीट्यूड के बारे में अभी साफ है, यह समझते हैं कि राष्ट्रपति अभी भी हमारे पक्ष में हैं और दक्षिण एशिया में कुछ उनका दृष्टिकोण अच्छा है, हमारे पक्ष में हैं डेवलपिंग कंट्रीज के पक्ष में हैं । यह दशा उनके दृष्टिकोण में है । लेकिन महोदया मैं आपके माध्यम से यह कहना चाहता हूं और मंत्री जी से कैटेगोरिकली पूछना चाहता हूं कि आपको अभी तक क्या साफ हुआ कि नहीं कि अमेरिका आपके हित के खिलाफ है ? अमेरिका का हित है, प्रधान हित है कि जितने भी दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया के देश हैं.... (समय की घंटी) जो डेवलपिंग कंट्रीज हैं, विकास

शील देश हैं उनमें उसका मारकेट बने। उनका प्रधान हित यही है। मारकेट बनाने के लिए ही सारा काम करेंगे, पाकिस्तान को हथियार देकर टेंशन पैदा करके लड़ाएंगे, श्रीलंका में आपको फंसाएंगे, वहां पर कन्स्ट्रेन कराएंगे, आर्थिक दबाव डालेंगे ताकि आपकी प्रगति न हो।

मैं दो क्लियर सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं। अब बातचीत हो रही थी वाशिंगटन में और खुद विदेश मंत्री जी वहां थे, प्रधान मंत्री जी के सहयोग में तो क्या इन्होंने अंदाज नहीं लगाया या इनके जो और सलाहकार थे, इम्बैसी के लोग थे क्या उन लोगों ने भी इनको कुछ नहीं बताया कि इसका आगे रिपरकशन क्या होगा ? दूसरा, क्या इनको अभी भी इस बात के बारे में भ्रम है कि रीगन प्रशासन हिन्दुस्तान के पक्ष में अपनी विदेश नीति और आर्थिक नीति को सहायता का कार्य अपनायेगा ?

अमरीकी सीनेट में इनके विरोधी हैं और न रीगन इनके पक्ष में है। अगर ऐसी इनकी दृष्टि है, तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह भुलावे में है और स्पष्ट हमको करना चाहिए कि अमरीका हमारे हित के खिलाफ रहता है, रहता आया है और आगे भी रहेगा। (समय की घंटी)

यह मुझको याद है, 1979 में जनता पार्टी की सरकार ने स्वाभिमानपूर्वक कहा कि हम न अमरीका से और न रूस से सहायता लेंगे और जब कहा कि सहायता नहीं लेंगे, तो दोनों सुपर पावर्ज ने मिल कर जनता पार्टी की सरकार पर दबाव डाला, मतलब उसको तोड़ने की कोशिश की।

आज हमको अपने स्वाभिमान को जगाना होगा, अमरीका पर की आत्मनिर्भरता को खत्म करना होगा और हमको कोई उपाय ढूंढना होगा। तब आपकी विदेश नीति चल सकती है, नहीं तो अमरीका कभी आपको ललकार कर फंसा देगा। श्रीलंका में तीन करोड़ रुपये प्रति दिन हमारा खर्च हो रहा है।

उपसभापति : श्रीलंका को छोड़िये, प्लीज।

श्री रामअवधेश सिंह : इनके विकास का सारा काम ठप्प पड़ा हुआ है और फिर आपको पाकिस्तान के साथ भिड़ा रहा है। उसमें आप फंसे हुए हैं।

इसलिए मैं इस फेल्योर के लिए प्रधान मंत्री से और विदेश मंत्री से तत्काल इस्तीफे की मांग करता हूं।

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra); Madam Deputy Chairman, just now the hon. Minister has made a statement. In the statement, para 3 says, and I quote:

"India made a commitment many , ago not to develop nuclear weapons. We bave kept our word. Our materials and facilities are dedicated to peaceful uses. We are against both vsrticil a.nd horizontal proliferation of ituclear weapons. But for reasons which we have stated openly and unequivocally, India is not prepared to pt a discriminatory non-proliferation regime. We stand by this position, and nothing wil! persuade or compel us to change it- It is regettable that the Seuirttee has thought fit to equate India's peaceful nuclear programme Pakistan's relentless pursuit of

> weapon-oriented programme. We cannot, and will not, accept this distorted view of the reality in our part of the world"

This has been clearly stated by the hon. Minister. Ta this regard, I would like to 'ask the hon. Minister a very pointed question. Pakistan has already manufactured its bomb and it is known as Islamic Bomb. And we are all aware of the fact that Pakistan is ,not a good friend of us. Their main intention is to acquire the sophisticated arms either from the United States of America or the Western block just to pose a threat to India. In this perspective, I would like to ask the hon. Minister as to what should be our policy. The nuclear threat is already there. Either it comes from the Western block or the Eastern

[Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav]

block, it is disastrous to all humanity. But we are now the largest democracy in the world. As one hon. Member has pointed out, India has to play a bigger role finitely because India is the biggest democracy in the world and the biggest democracy must play the biggest role in all the democratic States of the world. So, from that point of view, we must revise our policy towards nuclear weapons. And India must go nuclear and we must manufacture the nuclear bomb. For us it is not difficult to manufacture the nuclear bomb because our infrastructure is already there. Being a Member of the Science and Technology Consultative Committee, I have visited our several nuclear installations and nuclear power stations and our scientists are very much confident. Even in 1948, Dr. Bhaba very clearly told Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru that 'if you permit me, I can manufacture the nuclear bomb within 18 months.' We are having the technical know-how. We are having good scientists also. Now the time has come to revise our policy and we must go nuclear.

The second point is that the United States of America has recently said that it is giving 4,02 billion dollar aid to Pakistan. They have in the past also supplied sophisticated arms to Pakistan. And the American policy from the very beginning is that whoever be the neighbouring small countries, the under-developed countries to a big country, they are giving arms to the small countries and they are interfering and playing their CIA games so that the biggest democracies are destablised. Their economic development should not be there and the development process should be totally halted. That is the policy of the United States of America, right from Independence till today, and we are aware of that policy. Our Prime Minister is also aware of that policy and our Foreign Minister Is also aware of that policy. And, America, though it is not a good friend, but it would not be a bad enemy. This is our I licy till today and we have our indepenunt policy of non-alignment and the not lignment policy has bee accepted by 103 ations of the world and there is no other view but that India is for self respect, India is for self-reliance and India is the largest democrac in the world. So , from that Point of view we must have a clear cut policy towards the United States. If they speak sweet language, we should not go under their clutch and we have never gone under their clutch. All the western countries, the U.K., the U.S.A. and their allies have always been supporting Pakistan. Even a few days back, two days back, things appeared in the press that the 303 rifles which we have supplied to the United Kingdom, they have been shifted to Peshawar and they have been distributed to Mujahids and that is the role played by the CIA and the CIA is of America..

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; And that CIA has been given a clear chit by your Prime Minister. *(Interruptions).*

SHRT VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: But we had not expected it. So, all these things are to be taken together. We have to decide what our policy should be towards these countries and how we can remain self-reliant and realistic. Thank yon.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभापति जी हमको इसके बारे में तनिक भी शक नहीं होना चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान भारत के हितों के खिलाफ है और सारे भारत देश के खिलाफ है और इस मामले में जो इतिहास रहा है बराबर अमरीका उसमें मदद कर रहा है । पिछले 11 नवम्बर को जब प्रधान मंत्री जी संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ से हो करके भारतवर्ष में आये तो उन्होंने अपना प्रेसीडेंट रेगन के बातचीत के संबंध में जो आंकलन दिया और संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की जो सीनेट कमेटी है उसने जो अपनी संस्तुति की है उसमें बहुत बड़ा विरोधाभास है । इसने इस बात को साबित कर दिया है कि प्रेसीडेंट रेगन से बातचीत के संबंध में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो आंकलन दिया था वह सही नहीं था और जो आज परिस्थिति है इसने इसको बिल्कुल साबित कर दिया है । हम लोगों के मन में भी इस बात की तनिक भी शंका या

शुबहा नहीं है कि सन् 1965 में और 1971 में चाहे लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी प्रधान मंत्री रहे हों, चाहे श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी रही हों, पाकिस्तान को इस देश की जनता ने और इस देश के सिपाहियों ने मुंहतोड़ जवाब दिया था और उसके लिए हम सक्षम हैं । लेकिन फिर भी मैं दो बातें जानना चाहता हूं । एक तो जैसा मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा है कि सीनेट ने जो संस्तुति दी है उसकी हम प्रतीक्षा कर रहे हैं । आप प्रतीक्षा तो करिए । पता नहीं कितने दिन तक आपको प्रतीक्षा करनी पड़ेगी ? लेकिन इस बीच में क्या भारत के विपक्ष को इस संबंध में आप विश्वास में ले करके विपक्षी नेताओं की बैठक बुलायेंगे, अति-शीघ्र बैठक बुलायेंगे ? दूसरे संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के बारे में जो हमारा दृष्टिकोण है उसमें मूलभूत परिवर्तन होना चाहिए । इस मूलभूत परिवर्तन करने के लिए विपक्षी नेताओं की बैठक बुला करके सलाह-मशविरा करेंगे ? क्योंकि अभी आडवाणी जी ने सबह कहा कि लोकतंत्र में विपक्ष को राय को भी सुनना चाहिए और देश हित में उसको स्वीकार करना चाहिए । तो मैं स्पष्ट रूप से मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं कि इन दो विषयों पर क्या आप तुरन्त इस देश के जो विपक्षी नेता हैं उनकी बैठक बुलायेंगे ? धन्यवाद ।

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): Madam, Deputy Chairman, the recommendations of the Senate Committee of the United States of America for sanctioning $ 4.02 billion aid to Pakistan has caused a great panic among the public. It is quite contradictory, even disappointing to what we had expected earlier. The Hon. Prime Minister while submitting his statement regarding his tour to Vancouver and Washington gave us some good news and we were much pleas-ed actually after his visit to Washington when some of the press reports stated that there is a U-turn in the foreign policy of the United States towards India. There is a positive approach towards us. lt is a successful tour as far as our Prime Minister is concerned. These are the comments of the press. Ou;' Prime Minister also in his statement has stated: 'I had breakfast meetings with Congressional leaders, including the Speaker of the House of Representatives and Senate majority leader. As a result, there is now a greater recognition in the U.S. of the gravity of Pakistan's unrelenting quest for nuclear weapons.' These statements have become unture; it has been belied We have been disappointed by this statement. I would like to say lhat right from the beginning we have been failing in assessing our situation, right from 1962 with the Chinese war. Even now, in Sri Lanka, we have been trapped. We have become tools of Jayewardene Government. We are killing our own people, ignoring our objective. Similarly, in assessing the situation in the U.S.. also, we have failed,

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; What did the breakfast contain? What did he eat?

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: There was a talk between our Prime Minister and the President of the U.S. a.nd at Ihe end of the talk, President Reagan had stated; "I have agreed to the following items." He has narrated them, and I would like to mention what is appropriate. "To consult regularly and ensure U.S. Super Computer export to India; rapid pace scientific advancement; to-expand defence cooperation in technology and other military aids..." etc. How is the USA going to honour it after giving aid to this extent to Pakistan? Then, our Prime Minister, in his speech, stated that "we have watched with concern the developments in our immediate vicinity; nuclear stockpiles have multiplied. Yet another country, that is, Pakistan, now seems on the threshold of fulfilling long time goal of acquiring nuclear weapons. On our part, let me assure you, Mr. President, and the people of your country, that we have no intention of producing nuclear weapons unless constrained to do so." This was the reply by our hon. Prime Minister in Washington.

Now, the Senate Sub-Committee has recommended for an aid of 4.02 billion dollars. I would like to remind this House that in the U.S., the Senate is more powerful than its counterpart in 'any other country. It is more powerful than the House of Representatives, That is why, if there

[Shri Aladi Aruna Alias V. Arunachalam]

is a recommendation from the Senate Com mittee, it is not hypothetical; it is going to materialise. That is why I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he has takeh note of this fact. You cannot undermine the si The Senate there is supreme, as far as the U.S. system is concerned, not the House of Representative;. Treaties, Agreements, appointments of Supreme Court judges, and everything is to be ratified by the Senate of U.S.A., not by the House of Representatives. In this context, if there is a recommendation of the Sub-Committee of the Senate, it cannot be considered to be hypothetical. It is go'.ng to materialise. You cannot undermine it.

What !s your .'alternative to meet the situation when this recommendation is going to materia

I conclude and would like to seek this clarification from Ihe hon. Minister.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): I rise to seek on this very serious, engaging and frustrating issue...

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: Three Members from this party...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE RTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETRO-CHEMICALS IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI R. K. JAI-CHANDRA SINGH): I think, this man should be controlled.

SHRI **MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT** BHANDARE; This is far top serious, far too engaging and far too frustrating an issue for my friend to but in like this. I request him to understand the seriousness 'and gravity $_0$f the situation.

SHRr RAM AWADHESH SINGH: The Prime Minister does not realise...

SHRI MURUDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE; Madam, I want to invite tte attention of. . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think I will have to change your seats.

SHRl k. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH: What difference that will make?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I welcome any points made by him. But on an issue like this, he should observe some restraint.

Madam, there are two things which 1 ;he Government to take note of which I do not find in this otherwise fairly exhaustive and very good statement. One is that the amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act was drafted by senior Congressional aides in collusion with senior State Department officials. This is on? thing. Therefore, already, the State Department officials are in collusion. Secondly, this amendment was unprecedentedly approved by a consensus in a matter of minutes without a regular vote. These are two ominous things which the Governmenl should take note of.

Now, what is happening is that thcy are trying to equate our peaceful nuclcar programme with the more war-mongering development of a nuclear bomb by Pakistan. If I were to make a comparison, it is like comparing peace and war. It is like comparing democracy with dictatorship. It is like comparing independence with sovereignty. The comparison is not only unrealistic, highly illogical but it is totally tragic. We are the fourth in the word in terms *oi technological development.* We would get an aid of 350 million dollars, which is not even ten per cent of what Pakistan will get. Repeatedly, the U.S. has tinned a Nelson's eye in spite $_0$f the fact that there was a nuclear bomb in the Basement of Pakistan. I thin!;, things have come to a head now and there i_3 some 'assurance. After all that has been said by hon. Members of the Opposition, I want to invite the at!ention of the House to a very very significant sutemen; which was made by hon. Prime Minister much later, at Kohima only last week, saying that we would go nuclear if forced to. This really shows that everybody in the country, particularly, the Prime Minister, is aware of the serious nature of the situation. Twenty Members were on the Sub-Committee. It was a consensus decision. I canont imagine a more worse diplomatic failure than of not being able to convince half a dozen of them to say that we are right.

SHRl JAGESH DESAI; It is the policy of the U.S. Government. How can you change it?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: We have to change that policy. Kul as has been pointed out, what is most important is that we should stand firm. As 1 said in the meeting of the Consultative Committee of the Ministry of External Affairs, if America wants to play cool, let us play cooler. We care two hoot$_s$ for this high technology or anything of the U.S. We do not want any supercomputer at all. We will not bargain our independence. We will not bargain our peaceful development of nuclear programme. We will not bargain what we stand for, not only for ourselves but for the entire Third World as well. If the Senate approves this, it will be a very very sad day and the Government will have to mount and launch now the best diploma effort and lobby extensively to see that - such a disaster does not come about.

In the end, I would like the Government to stand firmly and let me assure you that every person in the country is with you. We will not allow pressures from any direction to alter our basic policy 'and we will maintain our independence at all costs and at whatever sacrifice that may be required from every citizen of the country. Thank you.

SHR! RAJNI RANJAN SAHU (Bihar); Madam, I appreciate and congratulate ihe hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of State for External Affairs, Shri Natwar Singh, for taking a stern attitude and making a bold statement on the Resolution of the Senate Appropriations Committee. ..

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu) ; Madam, when clarifications are sought, only one Member from each Party is allowed .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; The Minister want to take the opinion of the House.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: On a statement like this one Member from each party is allowed to seek clarifications. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU: Madam, recent unanimous resolution of the Senate Appropriation Committee of U.S. in regard to restoration of American aid to Paki tan is likely to change the scenario of th$_e$ entire concept of global peace and disarmament. It is a matter of serious concern for India. It is an outrageous action of the Senate Appropriation Committee of U.S. who have equated India with Pak on nuclear matters.

Madam, I would like to seek a small clarification, how far U.S. is going to be more trustworthy from the point of view of the people of India in the light of the shift in the U.S. 'attitude. Secondly. I fully endorse and agree with our friend that w$_e$ should not bargain our freedom and we should not submit to conditions for high technology transfer.

Further, Madam, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister towards the resolution of the sub-committee which says, I quote;

"Pakistan remains our sole military power in the region working to restrain Soviet expansionism."

I would like to know the reaction of the hon. Minister.

SHRl JAGESH DESAI: Madam, give me only two minutes.

I am not at all surprised by the action take,n by the U.S. Senate Committee. This is their policy. They want to use economic, lever for the purpose of getting their matters settled. They do not want an India which is committed to public sector, which is committed to the non-alignment movement and they do not agree with our foreign policy. When I was in Geneva to attend the UNCTAD conference, there also I found that they wanted to use economic lever to change our policy. So, this is nothing but what they perceive. Now that they have come in their true colours, will Che Government understand the basic policy of U.S. towards Tndia, are we going to have any defence cooperation? I know that at the time when we wanted help, they will not give it and they will

[Shri Jagesh Desai]

give this kind of excuses. So, I want tO' caution the Government that we should be very careful towards our approach regarding defence cooperation with the U.S. Government. Otherwise, in crucial times they would not come to our aid. A friend in need is a friend indeed. I hope the Government will take this into view. Otherwise, our country may have to face a difficult situation in the near future.

Madam, normally [do not agree with Shri Vajpayee but today on most of the points made by him I am in agreement with him. He was also the External Affairs Minister, he also understands it very well that they do not like our foreign policy. They want to change our policy and that is why they want to use this economic-lever. That is why I would like to caution the Government about this.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Madam, my question is, is it our perception that these changes are accidental? Eleven or twelve days back, the Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister number two, both of them, assured us that there will be a change. Today there is a change in another direction. Are all these accidental? 1 address this question to Congress benches also, including Mr. Jagesh Desai, Mr. Bhandare and others. If we are not able to see that it is in the very nature of capitalist imperialism to expand its suzerainty by hook or by crock all over the world, including the Socialist part of the world, it will be a mistake of our perception if we feel that they are trying to do harm to India alone. No, they are trying to harm Pakistan too. Anywhere if people try to stand on their feet, it is the business of imperialism, it is in the interest of capitalist imperialism to see that they cannot stand on their feet, beoause if they, then the profit of capital, existence of capital itself is threatened. If this understanding is not there in the perception of Government of India, then, as I was saying, what is necessary is not a change in U.S. policy—they will pursue the imperialist policy—but what is necessary is a change in the Government of India policy that the imperialists should never been depended upon, and seeking alli with and aid from the imperialists is never to be ventured upon. Only if the Indian Government can see and take such a path, then alone we can help the world to rid itself of such capitalist imperialism.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): While I agree with the views expressed by some of my friends from the Opposition that there exists a crisis of confidence, I do not agree with our honbble Janata leader that our diplomacy has failed. Our diplomacy has not failed. We stand where we have stood all along; our policy is tha same. If the success of diplomacy lies only in the fact that just for wrestling some as-sistnee we can bow under pressure, we can compromise with our ideals and our policies, then that is not diplomacy. In the case of Pakistan, Pakistan does not need to have any diplomacy with America today because America has adopted Pakistan as its own child. So Pakistan does not need any diplomacy. I congratulate my Government that in spite of nil that, we have stuck to our policy and Sand very boldly. We have not given way under any pressure, lt is no doubt un-fontunatae that after Prime Minister's visit, this thing has happened. Somebody was saying that Prime Minister's visit has not been a success. That was a success. It was a success not only by the reports in our press; it was a success by the reports that appeared in American media, by the talks which were held with President Reagan in a cordial 'and friendly atmosphere. It was a success because it led to greater collaboration and wo tried to increase our trade, and also because we successfully bargained for super computers. That was the success of it. But unfortunately the Sub-Committee of the Senate has tried to equate our programme with that of Pakistan. The views of the Sub-Committee cannot be the final views of the Semite itself. So we have to watch what the .Senate says, and what President Reaaan says. These developments. as our Minister has said, have to be watched. In this connection I would only like to ask the hon. Minister what further measures our Government contemplates or proposes

to take to dissuade America from equating our programme with Pakistan's nuclear programme. . . . *(Interruptions)* In the last sentence, lt is stated: "Government would like to assure the House that we will not allow pressures from any[1] direction to alter our basic policies". I do not say that we alter our basic p at all. But. naturally, because of this development and also because of the closeness of Pakistan to the evolution of a nuclear bomb of its own, now cur policy with regard to developing a nuclear bomb has to be reviewed, and I would like to know from the honourable Minister whether our Government, in these circumstances, will try to develop its own bomb as early as possible so that we can talk from a point of strength and bargain as a nuclear power also.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Madani Deputy Chairman, I listened with care and respect to the various observations, suggestions and criticism made by honourable Members. I am deeply sensitive to the feelings of honourable Members on this question and that is why Government decided to make a *suo motu* statement, because we wish to keep the House informed in this regard. Tt is a statement which has been drafted with care, and it says what it says in clear and unambiguous terms which will not go unnoticed by those to whom they are addressed. As implied by all the honourable Members, we have to approach this serious matter in a cool, calm, mature and balanced manner as we have done this afternoon, bearing in mind our vital national interests and also our long-term relations with the United States.

In the observations made by honourable Members, one of the questions asked was: What is the Congressional timetable? With your permission, Madam. I would Iike to mention to the House that on the 1st of December the Sub-Committee of the Senate Appropriations Committee discussed this matter. Now, at this time, the United States Congress is discussing the overall continuing Resolution for foreign assistance to all countries for the fiscal year 1988, and the aid to India and to Pakistan forms part of the overall continuing Resolution. On the 3rd the full Appropriations Committee discussed this. From tomorrow the full Senate will take this up and on the 9th, the conference between nominated representatives of both Houses—the Congress—will discuss this. After that, an agreed text wiil be sent to the President who is to approve of this month. At the moment, what we are discussing and what the statement has addressed itself to is the matter before this Congressional Committee.

Certainly, distinguished Members from the opposite side, who have held responsible posts in the Government of India, of course, know that the manner in which TJS legislation is carried out is—I am not giving an explanation; ! am just giving a fact—unpredictable. One could give any number of instances when this kind of a thing happened not only related to India but related to China, the Soviet Union and other countries. In foreign policy, it must be remembered that it was only less than a year ago that the President of the United States said that the Soviet Union was an evil empire, and today the President of the United States is playing host to Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev in Washington, because both countries have taken a long-term view of their relations, and I think it is in this perspective that we should look at this. I am not trying to minimise for a moment v/hat this Senate Committee has done, because it is totally unacceptable to us that a country like India, which has been pursuing for many, many years a peaceful nuclear programme, should be equated and linkages introduced in legislation, along with a country whose nuclear weapons programme is well known. This has been made known. As soon as we got news of this, the United States Ambassador was sent for, and he was asked to convey to the President our strong feelings on this. I then sent for the Ambassador myself the next day and told him that this was a very serious matter and that our concern should be conveyed to the United States Government. Yesterday morning he personally delivered a letter to me, and I shall like. Madam, with your permission, to read out the letter.

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

Till the legislative business is completed in the United States, till the Administration had a chance to look at it oi to have it altered or to have the objectionable passages deleted, we should not pre-judge the issue because we are dealing here with a super power ind with a grave and serious matter. The letter reads:

'My dear friend,

Last Friday evening..."

This is 6th December.

"....I met at length with Prime Ministetr Gandhi and yesterday, Decem-ber 5, I met with you at your residence. Both of you expressed to me your deep concern over the current discussions in the United States Congress regarding the U.S. assistance programme for Pakistan as they might affect Indo-U.S. relations. I was with, the Prime Minister in Washington on October 20. and I know and was witness to the warmth, cordiality and the determination of the U.S. Administration to continue im-proving relations with India. The current public discussions in Congress has not yet produced the definitive legislation. I would like assure you and the Indian Governmenl that my authorities in Washington have been alerted by your representative to your deep-felt concerns. In reply, I have been asked by my authorities to convey to you the following views;

"(1) The President of the United States and his Administration are aware of your position and your serious concerns.

(2) Our policy remains to continue improving our bilateral re'ation-ship. There can be no turning back from this policy.

(3) We continue to -import India's efforts towards self-reliance and are committed fo expanding co-operation in a number of fields such as high technology and trade.

(4) I have seen this to be my mission here during the last two years and committed to the continuation of this course.

I would like to assure you that the exe-cutive branch wil! work with the Congress to achieve changes in the proposed legislation to ensure that this policy is implemented.

With warm personal regards,

I remain,

John Gunther Dean."

this was the letter delivered yesterday and conveys to you, to the House and the country the formal position as it is on yesterday on this legislation which is being discussed.

Now, Sir, 1 would als$_0$ like to state why we look at this matter so gravely. Our relations with the United ijtates, as all Members knov/ .have to be divided into two parts. There is a positive part, and there is a negative part. And the negative part has been, for the past 30 years or more, the assistance, military and financial, that has been given by the United States to Pakistan. This has im-pinged on our relations with Pakistan because we are committed from the very beginning to have friendly, good-neigbourly, cordial relations with Pakistan. and particularly after the signing of the Simla Agreement that is so, and we are committed. Since 1947, I have been reading Panditji's speeches with regard tothe United States military aid to Pakistan, and in each statement that he has made in Parliament of India, he has always said, "Regardless of this, it shall be our endeavour to have friendly relations with the United States and the people of the United States." That rem:.ins our policy regardless of what they have done. But on the issue of Pakistan, very serious and grave doubts arise in the minds cf the Government and people of India in regard to the intentions of the donors of this financial and military aid. That is why we have taken this up. This has been the major impediment, and in my statement I have said so. And this is the statement which begins with this sentence:

"Last week the US Congress has considered some actions on South Asia

which, if enacted, would have adverse implications for our bilateral relations with the United Stales"

This is a more categorical statement of the views and feelings of the Government and the Parliament of India and mere than that cannot be made in the Parliament at this time. And if the United States Administration is able to have these portions deleted then our efforts would have succeeded. If, however, these portions are deleted in a manner, not wholly satisfactory, then some measure of success would have been obtained. But if they stand as it is then the relations with the United States and India must be adversely affected. So, it is our sincere hope that the US Administration will carefully look at what we have said and will carefully go through the deliberations of this House today. I am to make a statement in the other House also. The mes age will go clear that there was a unanimous feeling in the Parliament of India that what the United States was doing in this regard by equating the nuclear programmes was unjust, unfair and uncalled for.

I would like to once again thank hon. Members for the manner in which they have spoken. Responsible, statesmanlike manner and the high standard of this debate strengthens Government's efforts to have this legislation altered. Thank; you, Madam.

Reported Remarks of Home Minister, Shri Buta Singh, against Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh—Contd.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we take up further discussion on the matter raised with permission.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I have the privilege of speaking limmediately after Advani Ji and I am particularly grateful for that opportunity because out of our great respect for him personally and for whatever views that he expressed, I would like to say that all of us in the House are in agreement with him, upon the sentiments that he expressed, about certain standards that are expected of political leaders especially in their utterances about other political leaders. I also agree with great respect that it is totally wrong and irresponsible—I think, that is what he said—for any political leader to call a Chief Minister anti-national or to say that he advocated casteist feelings and communalism. Such a leader suffers from a certain lack of responsibility. That is what Advani Ji said. But I want to point out whether this be true or not, whether I disagree with it or not, whether what the hon. Home Minister said was true or not or whether he was properly quoted or not, that the fact remains that time and again in this House, in various public fora, at election meetings and in various important places, even as important a place as the Opposition convention at Surajkund, they had called the Prime Minister in far worse terms. Advani Ji had said that six crore people oi Andhra have elected Mr. Rama Rao I say that 800 million Indians have elected the Prime Minister. They called him far worse names. I am not going to read it because it is a disgusting slur. *(Interruptions)*

The Vice Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair]

They have called him far worse names. I am not going to read them because they are disgusting slur upon the highest office in the land, upon the Prime Minister. If anybody wishes, I can read straightaway from the paper and they can see it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH* DESAI): No, please.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: No, I am not going to read it. but the fact remains that they called him far worse than anti-national They called him far worse names. It is not only Mr. Rama Rao himself, but Mr. Devi Lal also. They accused him of bartering away the integrity of the nation. They accused him of terrible things. Therefore, assuming without admitting any lack of responsibility, I charge leaders of all Opposition leaders of a far greater lack ot